

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 28, 2003

LB 622, 758

to drop property tax? That's why we've got a lid, isn't it? And it's why we do this money. It's, in fact, exactly to lower property taxes. Which is why being a restricted fund I think is more consistent with the public policy than being an unrestricted fund. I asked George to write me an amendment to try to get a rifle shot solution here--300,000 bucks for the cities that don't have a sales tax. That will be the 18 percent of cities who do that. Maybe it's a good idea, maybe it's a bad idea. But I'll tell you this. This solution is greater and much more expensive than the...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...justification offered for its...as its rationale. The legitimate rationale for this amendment...which I think, as Laertes says in Hamlet, is a touch, I confess...is there will be cities that won't get any benefit from LB 758, and that will lose money from the state. Fair enough. I acknowledge that. This, on the other hand, goes a good deal further, to the tune of about \$3 million further than that, which is why I'm not in favor of this amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Engel, on the motion to return LB 622.

SENATOR ENGEL: Mr. President, members of the body, I'd like to ask Senator Raikes a question, if he'd respond.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Raikes, would you respond to a question?

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes.

SENATOR ENGEL: Will this affect any city this fiscal year?

SENATOR RAIKES: It...let me try to give you a complete answer to that. The...all of the monies that cities were made to believe that they could count on will in fact be delivered. To the extent there would have been extra, unplanned money available, and if some city was planning on some unplanned money, I suppose they could argue that, well, they would be